

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 10/774,629 | 02/10/2004 | Naoaki Yamanaka | 040803-0307870 | 9790 |
| 909 7590 08/09/2007 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN WA 22102 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | KEEFER, MICHAEL E | |
| MCLEAN, VA 22102 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2154 | | |
| | | | *************************************** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | • | 08/09/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mN

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/774,629 | YAMANAKA ET AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Michael E. Keefer | 2154 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)🖾 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 i | February 2004. | | | | |
| • | This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) 🖾 | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11,14,15,21 and 25</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) 🗌 | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | Claim(s) <u>1-11,14,15,21 and 25</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| · | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2004 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09/490,283</u> . | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail D | ate | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/10/2004. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: | | | | | | |
| . apc | 7/ Land 1 | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/774,629

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Application filed 2/10/2004.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/490283, filed on 1/20/2000.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-3 and 11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 8, 9, 10-11 of U.S. Patent No.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,629 Page 3

Art Unit: 2154

6756283. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in Patent 6757283 anticipate at least claims 1-3 and 11 of the instant application, see in re Goodman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-11, 14-15, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy (US 6545982) in view of Bushmitch (EP 0915598).

As shown in Figs. 1-20, Murthy discloses a network which pushes data to various ports and subsequently To the networks and devices (e.g., A0 B0, T, Fig. 1) connected to those ports (abstract), a means for copying information (Col. 2, lines 49-56; col. 13, lines 30-34; col. 18, lines 10-22, and lines 60-67), distributing packets (col. 9, lines 1-54; broadcast multicast table, col. 15), adding a content ID (protocol ID, address, length field, CRC, various headers, col. 7-9, especially col. 8, lines 16-58; packet descriptor or mask, cols. 11-12, and cl. 17, especially col. 111, lines 5-60, and col. 12, lines 50-59), decideing whether to distribute packets (col. 8, lines 15-67; cols. 11-12), tables (e.g., B/M table col. 15), registering a content ID (using the tables, col. 14), table entries with notification from user and deleting means (e.g., XMASKs, col. 13, lines 6-46; custom filtering rules, col. 14, table entries, col. 16, lines 16-45), storing packet with decision means (buffering packets with protocol ID, subfields, various headers, (col. 9, lines 20-

54; packet descriptors, col. 10, line 41 - col. 12 line 67). However, Murthy fails to call for a push network.

Bushmitch teaches a push network and admission control of devices registering with service providers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Murthy and Bushmitch because both networks send multicast traffic to devices, and Bushmitch offers details of end devices registering (using call admission control CAC) with service providers. It would have been obvious for the end users to register with service providers in order to set up a call or to set up a path such as a VPI/VCI. Murthy discloses packet based protocols (col. 4, lines 20-30) and ATM which uses CAC is one such packet based protocol.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael E. Keefer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 5:30am-2pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,629 Page 5

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.usptorgov. Status you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic ATENTIAL PRIVATE AND AND ASSISTANCE FROM A USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 8/4/2007